

Remarks

The numbered paragraphs of the office action are responded to through the corresponding numbered paragraphs below. The applicant has addressed each issue in turn and, for clarity, has provided a heading for each issue.

Claim Objections

1. The Examiner objected to claim 1 because of a typographical informality. The applicant has requested that claim 1 be amended as suggested to fully address this objection. Applicant believes the correction of claim 1 fully addresses the objection of this paragraph.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

2. The Examiner provided the basis for the rejections under this section in the Office action. The Applicant believes no response is required for this paragraph.
3. The Examiner rejected claims 1 to 10 "under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlisle." The applicant has requested that claims 1 and 7 be amended to more clearly point out features, which in combination with the previous elements of the claims, that applicant believes are neither disclosed, described or suggested either alone or in combination by the cited references or any other known reference. Specifically, the applicant has requested that claim 1 be amended to more clearly point out the drainage opening provided in applicant's invention which is particularly useful because often motorboat propellers are covered by applicant's invention soon after removal from the

water. Without a drainage capability the cover tends to retain water which substantially reduces the performance of the cover of this invention. The applicant has requested that claim 7 be amended to more clearly point out that in this mesh embodiment of applicant's invention the bag is sized and shaped specifically to fit about the propeller in such a way as to generally adopt the shape of the propeller. This is an important feature since one of the important purposes of applicant's invention is to enhance the visibility of the propeller when a trailered boat is being towed. Since claims 2-6 depend on claim 1 and claims 8-10 depend on claim 7, these claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims on which they depend. Applicant believes that the requested amendment and these remarks are fully responsive to the rejection of this paragraph. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

4. The Examiner indicated that certain "prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure." The applicant appreciates the Examiner's search and respectfully requests that these references be included amount the references cited.
5. The Examiner provided information concerning communication on this case. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's willingness to discuss this case and believes that no response to this requirement is required.

Applicant has requested that the claims be amended as previously described.

Applicant believes that all issues and points of the Examiner's Office Action have been addressed. Applicant believes that the newly amended claims (claims 1 and 7) and those claims dependent on the amended claims are patentable over the prior art.

Reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted this 8th day of November, 2002.



Lloyd W. Sadler, Reg. No. 40,154
PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER
201 South Main Street, Suite 1800
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 532-1234
Facsimile: (801) 536-6111